CTPU-16-45

Probing the chirality of dark matter at colliders with dark photon showering

Minho Kim,[1,2] Hye-Sung Lee,[1] Myeonghun Park,[1] and Mengchao Zhang[1,*]

[1] *Center for Theoretical Physics of the Universe, Institute for Basic Science (IBS), Daejeon, 34051, Korea*
[2] *Department of Physics, POSTECH, Pohang 37673, Korea*

(Dated: January 15, 2017)

As conventional dark matter scenarios have been probed extensively so far, the physics of a light dark matter charged under a new gauge group (dark gauge group) becomes one of new research avenues in many theoretical and experimental studies. We examine properties of a dark photon showering, the radiation process of light gauge bosons from energetic dark matter particles produced at the Large Hadron Collider (LHC). This showering process provides different signatures at the LHC depending on the property of dark matter under the dark gauge group. We show that the LHC experiment can identify the chirality of a dark matter, which leads to understanding the mass origin of particles in the dark sector.

PACS numbers: 14.80.-j,12.60.-i

arXiv:1612.02850v2 [hep-ph] 19 Jan 2017

Introduction.— The confirmation of dark matter (DM) existence will be the one of major milestones toward the physics beyond the standard model (SM) of the particle physics. Among various scenarios about dark matter, a weakly-interacting massive particle (WIMP) [1], often in the supersymmetry framework [2], has been extensively tested by various dark matter direct search (DD) experiments [3, 4] together with collider experiments including the LHC [5]. In near future, sensitivity of DD experiments will reach the point of detecting irreducible backgrounds from neutrino-nucleus coherent scattering [6].

In contrast to WIMP dark matter, searching for a light dark matter of sub-GeV mass scale with conventional DD experiments is very challenging due to low nuclear recoil energy $E_{\rm NR} < \mathcal{O}(0.1)\,$keV over experimental resolutions and noises [7]. There have been growing interests in the sub-GeV dark matter recently, and new experiments have been initiated and proposed [8–10]. They include direct searches of a relic dark matter particle [11] as well as beam experiments that produce dark matter particles and detect their signals by using low-energy beam facilities [12, 13]. Contrast to DD experiments, the LHC has provided results of detecting a sub-GeV dark matter particle by utilizing initial state radiation (ISR) jet to tag events with dark matter particles as we have accumulated precise understanding in Quantum Chromodynamics (QCD) to suppress SM backgrounds [14].

Together with conventional dark matter experiments which are sensitive mostly to interactions between dark matter and SM particles, it would be interesting to consider phenomenological effects of dark matter scenarios if there exists an interaction among dark matter itself [15, 16]. One of natural methods to implement an interaction among dark matter particles is to introduce a dark gauge symmetry on dark matter [17–22]. Especially a light dark gauge boson has been spotlighted in the intensity frontier research [23]. The combination of a light dark matter particle and a light gauge boson fits well, as a light gauge boson can provide a suitable annihilation channel for the dark matter particles demanded by the DM relic density constraint [24, 25].

In this letter, we investigate generic collider signatures of a light dark matter particle, which is charged under a dark gauge group. The collider phenomenology of non-abelian dark gauge group has been studied for a composite dark matter particle [26–28]. Contrast to previous studies, we focus on an abelian dark gauge group, motivated by current efforts in dark photon searches [23]. A dark gauge boson shower process can be triggered, once a "dark charged" dark matter particle is produced with a sufficient energy. Our emphasis is to explain the difference in collider signatures, depending on the chirality of dark matter under a dark gauge group[1]. A chiral interaction is induced by a dark higgs boson if it provides a mass to a dark photon through dark symmetry breaking and if dark matter becomes massive via yukawa interaction. Thus we point out that recognizing patterns in dark photon showering can be a good probe to examine the mass origin of particles in a dark sector.

Framework.— The Lagrangian of dark matter χ under a dark gauge group $U(1)_d$ are following;

$$\mathcal{L}_{\rm vector+scalar} = -\frac{1}{4}F'_{\mu\nu}F'^{\mu\nu} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}F_{\mu\nu}F'^{\mu\nu} + |D_\mu\Phi|^2, \quad (1)$$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_{\rm matter} = {}& \bar{\chi}_L i\gamma^\mu D_\mu \chi_L + \bar{\chi}_R i\gamma^\mu D_\mu \chi_R + \bar{\psi}_L i\gamma^\mu D_\mu \psi_L \\ & + \bar{\psi}_R i\gamma^\mu D_\mu \psi_R - y_\chi \bar{\chi}_L \Phi^* \chi_R - y_\chi \bar{\chi}_R \Phi \chi_L \\ & - y_\psi \bar{\psi}_L \Phi \psi_R - y_\psi \bar{\psi}_R \Phi^* \psi_L, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

with $D_\mu \equiv \partial_\mu + ig'Q'A'_\mu$ where A'_μ is the quantum field of a dark photon γ_d, g' is the gauge coupling of the

* mczhang@ibs.re.kr

[1] A recent work [29] gives a systematic analysis of the dark mass origin and its impact on Cosmology and Astronomy.

dark gauge symmetry, Q' is the dark $U(1)_d$ charge. $F_{\mu\nu}$ and $F'_{\mu\nu}$ are the field strength of the SM photon and dark photon respectively, and ε is the kinetic mixing parameter [30]. The SM particles are not charged under a dark gauge group. Here as we focus on a light dark photon where the mass of a dark photon is negligible compared to the mass of Z boson, the effect of SM electroweak symmetry breaking on a kinetic mixing becomes irrelevant to interactions between a dark photon and particles in the SM [31, 32]. Φ is a dark higgs which may break $U(1)_d$ depending on its charge under the dark gauge group. We introduce two pairs of chiral fermions χ as dark matter and ψ as a heavier particle in a dark sector for the anomaly cancellation, which is model-dependent part. The yukawa terms in eq. (2) dictate the relations of the dark $U(1)_d$ charges: $Q'_{\chi_L} - Q'_{\chi_R} + Q'_\Phi = 0$, $-Q'_{\psi_L} + Q'_{\psi_R} + Q'_\Phi = 0$. For the anomaly cancellation, we take $Q'_{\chi_L/\chi_R} = -Q'_{\psi_L/\psi_R}$, which allows a mixing between the χ and ψ. In our analysis, however, we will focus on the phenomenology of a dark matter χ.

As pointed out in [29], non-zero charge Q'_Φ of a dark higgs induces the chiral nature of dark matter. When we rewrite the interaction between a dark matter and a dark photon,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{matter}} \ni -g' Q'_V A'_\mu \bar{\chi}\gamma^\mu \chi - g' Q'_A A'_\mu \bar{\chi}\gamma^\mu\gamma_5\chi\,, \tag{3}$$

the axial Q'_A and vector coupling Q'_V are written as;

$$Q'_A = \frac{1}{2}\left(Q'_{\chi_R} - Q'_{\chi_L}\right) = \frac{Q'_\Phi}{2}\,, \tag{4}$$

$$Q'_V = \frac{1}{2}\left(Q'_{\chi_R} + Q'_{\chi_L}\right) = \frac{Q'_\Phi}{2} + Q'_{\chi_L}\,. \tag{5}$$

The chirality of a dark matter particle ($Q'_A \neq 0$) results in a significant difference in collider signatures at the LHC as we will show later.[2]

There are several ways to address a small dark gauge boson mass even when a gauge coupling constant is not small [35–37]. In this paper we take a small vacuum expectation value v_S of the dark higgs Φ given by $\Phi = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(v_S + S + i\phi_S)$. The masses of the dark gauge boson and dark matter are given by the vacuum expectation value of the dark higgs boson as $m_{\gamma_d} = g' Q'_\Phi v_S$ and $m_\chi = y_\chi v_S/\sqrt{2}$.

Splitting Kernel of a chiral dark matter.— We describe the different showering patterns of a dark photon γ_d from an energetic dark matter χ depending on its chiral nature. In a collinear region, the differential probability of the splitting process $\chi \to \chi\gamma_d$ is;

$$\frac{\alpha'}{2\pi} dx \frac{dt}{t} P_{\chi\to\chi\gamma_d}(x,t). \tag{6}$$

Here, $\alpha' = g'^2/4\pi$, t is the virtuality of incoming χ, and x is the energy fraction taken by outgoing χ. A detailed analysis of dark photon showers from vector-like dark fermion model has been studied in [38]. As we focus on the phenomenology of an energetic dark matter production at colliders, we ignore terms suppressed by m_χ^2/t or $m_{\gamma_d}^2/t$. In this limit, the splitting kernel for vector-like dark matter is given [39];

$$P_{\chi\to\chi\gamma_d}(x,t) \simeq Q'^2_V \frac{1+x^2}{1-x}\,, \tag{7}$$

This shower pattern is similar to the familiar QED shower which only includes contributions from transverse polarizations of a photon.

The longitudinal polarization vector of a dark photon will grow as $E_{\gamma_d}/m_{\gamma_d}$, with the energy of a dark photon E_{γ_d}. This artificial enhancement can be tamed by the Goldstone boson equivalence theorem (GBET) [40]. While the leading contribution of a longitudinal polarization in high energy limit is expressed by GBET which is proportional to m_χ/m_{γ_d}, the remaining part is suppressed by $m_{\gamma_d}/E_{\gamma_d}$ [41–43]. Thus this sub-leading part can be neglected in our study as we are interested in the phase space region of $E_{\gamma_d} \gg m_{\gamma_d}$. With GBET, we obtain a splitting kernel for the chiral fermions as following;

$$P_{\chi\to\chi\gamma_d}(x,t) \simeq \left(Q'^2_V + Q'^2_A\right)\frac{1+x^2}{1-x} + 2Q'^2_A \frac{m_\chi^2}{m_{\gamma_d}^2}. \tag{8}$$

The first term is from the transverse modes of a dark photon, and a factor $\frac{1}{2}$ reflects the chiral nature of dark matter. The second term is from the longitudinal mode of a dark photon, which would be significant when a dark photon is very light compared to dark matter. Unlike the chiral dark matter, a vector-like dark matter does not have an interaction with a Goldstone boson. Thus only transverse polarization of a dark photon is involved in a showering process as in eq. (7). In the next section, we show the corresponding collider phenomenology by examining dark photon showering pattern.

Phenomenology of the dark showering.— The parameters that are directly related to a dark photon showering are $(\alpha', m_\chi, m_{\gamma_d})$ and (Q'_A, Q'_V). For simplicity, we choose $(Q'_A, Q'_V) = \left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\right)$. The longitudinal component of a splitting kernel in eq. (8) indicates that a large mass hierarchy between m_χ and m_{γ_d} will induce significant difference in the shower process from the chiral dark matter compared to the case of a vector-like dark matter. But in order to keep the dark yukawa coupling within a perturbative limit as $(y_\chi/\sqrt{2})^2 \lesssim 4\pi$, the mass spectrum of m_χ and m_{γ_d} follow a limit;

$$\alpha' \frac{m_\chi^2}{m_{\gamma_d}^2} \lesssim 1\,. \tag{9}$$

To avoid constraints from current dark matter and dark photon search experiments [3, 4, 7, 8, 10–13] we take quite light benchmark points as in Table I. In our benchmark

[2] This can be inferred from, for example, the distinct phenomenology depending on the chirality of SM fermions on dark gauge group [33, 34] when corresponding dark gauge boson is very light.

Benchmark Points (BP)	A	B	C
α'	0.3	0.15	0.075
m_χ (GeV)	0.7	1.0	1.4
m_{γ_d} (GeV)	0.4		

TABLE I. Benchmark points we have chosen. They obey the perturbative limit of $\alpha' \frac{m_\chi^2}{m_{\gamma_d}^2} \lesssim 1$.

points of $m_{\gamma_d} = 0.4\,\text{GeV}$, a viable kinematic mixing parameter ϵ can provide prompt decays of dark photons to the SM particles. More specifically, for our bench mark points, ϵ^2 smaller than 10^{-7} is still allowed by current constraints [9]. If ϵ is too small, SM particles from a dark photon decays would leave displaced vertices for us to enhance the search power at the LHC [44]. With $\epsilon^2 > 10^{-10}$, the impact parameter of particles from dark photon is smaller than 1 mm, as particles from dark photon decays can be treated as prompt [45]. In this case, a dark photon mostly decays into a pair of light leptons where these non-conventional signatures are easy to tag over the QCD backgrounds. The corresponding branching ratios are $\text{BR}(\gamma_d \to \mu^+\mu^-) \simeq 0.45$, $\text{BR}(\gamma_d \to e^+e^-) \simeq 0.45$, and $\text{BR}(\gamma_d \to \pi^+\pi^-) \simeq 0.10$.

Particles from dark photon showering processes would be tagged at collider detectors when they can leave certain level of energy deposits. Thus we consider following two independent phase space configurations of dark matter production modes at the LHC as in Fig. 1, where initially produced dark matter particles can achieve enough energy to radiate dark photons over certain energy threshold. The first one is a situation where dark matter gets hard recoils against ISR jets. We describe this case with an effective operator as a very heavy vector mediator being integrated out [46].

$$\mathcal{L} \ni \frac{1}{\Lambda^2}(\bar{q}\gamma^\mu q)(\bar{\chi}\gamma_\mu\chi)\,, \tag{10}$$

here q denotes a SM quark. For a ISR jet, we consider a jet with a transverse momentum $p_T > 200$ GeV. The second case is where a massive mediator is produced and dark matter particles get enough energy from the decay process of the heavy mediator. For a heavy mediator, we take a vector Z' boson with $m_{Z'} = 1.5$ TeV and corresponding Lagrangians are

$$\mathcal{L} \ni -g_1' Z'_\mu \bar{q}\gamma^\mu q + g_2' Z'_\mu \bar{\chi}\gamma_\mu\chi\,. \tag{11}$$

We perform Monte Carlo studies with FeynRules 2.0 [47] to implement dark matter models, MadGraph_aMC@NLO [48] and Pythia 8 [49]. In simulating dark photon showering processes, we modify a Hidden Valley model [50, 51] implemented in Pythia 8 [52] to add longitudinal term in eq. (8) with a guidance described in [53]. To quantify difference in signatures at the LHC from distinct showering patterns, we examine how many changes occur in the number of produced dark photons at the LHC depending on the



FIG. 1. We consider two cases for radiating dark matters where (a) dark matters get energy recoils against hard ISR jets, (b) dark matters get energy boost from the decay of a heavy resonance Z'.



FIG. 2. The left column is for the comparison of the dark photon number distribution of our benchmark points between a vector-like dark matter and chiral dark matter. Red line and blue line correspond to vector-like model and chiral model respectively. The right column is for the comparison of the $H_{T(\ell)}$ distribution of our benchmark points with the same color code as cases in the left column.

chirality of dark matter. For an illustration purpose, we use an effective operator of eq. (10) in producing dark matter at the LHC. In the left column of Fig. 2, we plot histograms of the number of showered dark photons per event. As we observe, with increasing the mass of dark matter, the number of showered dark photons is reduced in a vector-like dark matter case as a dark gauge coupling α' is decreasing to satisfy the perturbative limit of eq. (9). But in a chiral dark matter scenario, the number of the dark photon is almost unchanged due to the enhancement from the GBET with a large yukawa coupling in the second term of eq. (8).



FIG. 3. χ^2 distance of $H_{T(\ell)}$ distributions between a vector-like dark matter scenario and chiral dark matter case for (a) dark matters are produced through an effective operator in eq. (10) and (b) dark matters are from the decay of a heavy Z' as in eq. (11).

Once, a dark photon is produced from a dark showering process, it decays to SM particles through a kinetic mixing ϵ in eq. (1). To quantify those signatures, we use the scalar sum of the muon and electron transverse momentum p_T;

$$H_{T(\ell)} = \sum_{i=\mu^\pm, e^\pm} |p_{T\,i}|. \tag{12}$$

In the right column of Fig. 2 we observe that a dark photon shower in the vector-like dark matter case becomes weak and most of leptons become soft as a coupling constant α' gets smaller. In a chiral dark matter case, showering processes with a longitudinal mode of a dark photon, which is independent on α', becomes dominant through an enhancement from a yukawa interaction as dark matter becomes massive. Due to GBET, the energy spectrum of leptons from a longitudinal mode is larger compared to the case of leptons from a transverse mode of dark photons.

To consider various factors including isolation of reconstructed objects and smearing effects on energy deposits, we use Delphes 3 [54] to perform a fast detector simulation with the ATLAS parameter setting. To suppress SM backgrounds, we take following cuts. As we consider a minimal set up in producing dark matters, we employ a mono-jet cut with a leading jet of a transverse momentum $p_T > 200\,\text{GeV}$. This is a required mono-jet cut in conventional dark matter searches at the LHC [14]. We also restrict the number of jets by allowing maximally up to four jets with $p_T > 30\,\text{GeV}$ within the detector geometry of $|\eta| < 2.8$.

Secondly, we adopt the concept of lepton-jet [44, 55] to cluster collimated muons from a light dark photon. As a light dark photon decays mostly the pair of leptons, we only consider a muon-jet as a candidate to suppress QCD backgrounds as we can identify individual muons in muon-jet by utilizing various sub-detectors to perform χ^2 fitting for muon tracks. Considering electron-jet for a signal object would non-trivial as bremsstrahlung processes of electrons force us to merge several crystals in electronic calorimeters, making it difficult to isolate each electrons in collimated situations and requiring additional properties to reduce QCD backgrounds [44, 56]. Thus we require at least one muon-jet for an additional criteria to tag signals over backgrounds. A candidate muon in the muon-jet needs to have $p_T > 10\,\text{GeV}$ within $|\eta| < 2.5$. Then we use the Cambridge/Aachen jet algorithm [57] with FastJet [58] to cluster a muon-jet with $\Delta R < 0.1$. An isolation variable for a muon-jet is defined as:

$$\rho = \frac{\sum_i E_{T,i}}{p_{T,\mu J}}, \tag{13}$$

with i running over all the E_T deposit in the calorimeter, without the candidate muons, near the muon-jet with $\Delta R < 0.3$, and the denominator is the p_T of the muon-jet. We require $\rho < 0.3$ together with a muon-jet mass within the range between 0.3 GeV and 1.0 GeV.

Finally, we describe how one can understand the nature of a dark sector once we observe dark matter signatures at the LHC. To deal with a finite luminosity of the LHC, we generated 200 reconstructed signal events after cuts. We perform 100 pseudo-experiments with each 200 reconstructed signal events to reduce statistical uncertainties coming from simulating finite number of events. For a collider observable, we compare $H_{T(\ell)}$ variable in eq. (12) distribution with muons of $p_T \geq 5\,\text{GeV}$ and electrons of $p_T \geq 10\,\text{GeV}$ by considering momentums from tracks and energy deposits in sub-detectors. We calculate a binned-χ^2 of two histograms from a vector-like case and chiral case. Fig. 3 shows our results from χ^2 comparison where (a) dark matter produced via an effective operator and (b) dark matter pair are produced through a heavy Z' of $m_{Z'} = 1.5\,\text{TeV}$. For (b) case, we do not require mono-jet cut to tag signal events as dark matters get enough energy from a heavy Z'. In a case of Z', for the parameter region of $\alpha' > 0.25$ and $m_\chi < 0.45$ GeV, the vector-like and chiral dark matter models can be also distinguished by 2σ significance level because of the weaker transverse modes shower in the chiral dark matter case.

Discussions and outlook.— The Standard Model had been developed by constructing gauge structures. At

the LHC, we checked its validity from the discovery of the Higgs particle which provides a mass to SM particles. Similarly identifying the gauge structure of a dark sector together with understanding the mass origin of dark particles would be the first step toward expanding the physics of dark matter once we observe a dark matter signature. With the performance of the LHC which is currently the most sensitive tool to probe a light dark matter, we study the feature of collider signatures from a dark photon showering depending on the property of dark matter under a dark gauge group. With numerical simulations of 14 TeV LHC, we show that we can identify the nature of dark matter with $\mathcal{O}(200)$ signal events at the LHC.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

MZ appreciates helps from authors of Pythia 8, Torbjorn Sjostrand, Nishita Desai and Peter Skands for modifying a Pythia showering subroutine. This work is supported by IBS under the project code, IBS-R018-D1.

[1] B. W. Lee and S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **39**, 165 (1977). doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.39.165

[2] G. Jungman, M. Kamionkowski and K. Griest, Phys. Rept. **267**, 195 (1996) [hep-ph/9506380]. G. Bertone, D. Hooper and J. Silk, Phys. Rept. **405**, 279 (2005) [hep-ph/0404175].

[3] A. Tan *et al.* [PandaX-II Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **117**, no. 12, 121303 (2016) [arXiv:1607.07400 [hep-ex]]; D. S. Akerib *et al.*, arXiv:1608.07648 [astro-ph.CO].

[4] K. Schneck *et al.* [SuperCDMS Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **91**, no. 9, 092004 (2015) [arXiv:1503.03379 [astro-ph.CO]]. D. S. Akerib *et al.* [LZ Collaboration], arXiv:1509.02910 [physics.ins-det]. J. Aalbers *et al.* [DARWIN Collaboration], arXiv:1606.07001 [astro-ph.IM].

[5] D. Abercrombie *et al.*, arXiv:1507.00966 [hep-ex].

[6] J. Billard, L. Strigari and E. Figueroa-Feliciano, Phys. Rev. D **89**, no. 2, 023524 (2014) [arXiv:1307.5458 [hep-ph]].

[7] G. Angloher *et al.* [CRESST Collaboration], Eur. Phys. J. C **76**, no. 1, 25 (2016) [arXiv:1509.01515 [astro-ph.CO]]. R. Agnese *et al.* [SuperCDMS Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, no. 7, 071301 (2016) [arXiv:1509.02448 [astro-ph.CO]]. R. Agnese *et al.* [SuperCDMS Collaboration], [arXiv:1610.00006 [physics.ins-det]]. A. Aguilar-Arevalo *et al.* [DAMIC Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **94**, no. 8, 082006 (2016) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.94.082006 [arXiv:1607.07410 [astro-ph.CO]].

[8] M. Battaglieri *et al.* [BDX Collaboration], arXiv:1607.01390 [hep-ex].

[9] J. Alexander *et al.*, arXiv:1608.08632 [hep-ph].

[10] P. deNiverville, C. Y. Chen, M. Pospelov and A. Ritz, arXiv:1609.01770 [hep-ph].

[11] R. Essig, A. Manalaysay, J. Mardon, P. Sorensen and T. Volansky, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 021301 (2012) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.109.021301 [arXiv:1206.2644 [astro-ph.CO]].

[12] R. Dharmapalan *et al.* [MiniBooNE Collaboration], arXiv:1211.2258 [hep-ex].

[13] D. Banerjee *et al.* [NA64 Collaboration], arXiv:1610.02988 [hep-ex].

[14] M. Aaboud *et al.* [ATLAS Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **94**, no. 3, 032005 (2016) [arXiv:1604.07773 [hep-ex]]. CMS Collaboration [CMS Collaboration], CMS-PAS-EXO-16-013.

[15] B. A. Gradwohl and J. A. Frieman, Astrophys. J. **398**, 407 (1992). doi:10.1086/171865

[16] D. N. Spergel and P. J. Steinhardt, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 3760 (2000) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.84.3760 [astro-ph/9909386].

[17] D. Hooper and K. M. Zurek, Phys. Rev. D **77**, 087302 (2008) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.77.087302 [arXiv:0801.3686 [hep-ph]].

[18] J. L. Feng and J. Kumar, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 231301 (2008) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.101.231301 [arXiv:0803.4196 [hep-ph]].

[19] L. Ackerman, M. R. Buckley, S. M. Carroll and M. Kamionkowski, Phys. Rev. D **79**, 023519 (2009) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.79.023519, [arXiv:0810.5126 [hep-ph]].

[20] J. L. Feng, M. Kaplinghat, H. Tu and H. B. Yu, JCAP **0907**, 004 (2009) doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2009/07/004 [arXiv:0905.3039 [hep-ph]].

[21] Y. Hochberg, E. Kuflik, H. Murayama, T. Volansky and J. G. Wacker, Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, no. 2, 021301 (2015) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.115.021301 [arXiv:1411.3727 [hep-ph]].

[22] J. Kopp, J. Liu, T. R. Slatyer, X. P. Wang and W. Xue, JHEP **1612**, 033 (2016) doi:10.1007/JHEP12(2016)033 [arXiv:1609.02147 [hep-ph]].

[23] R. Essig *et al.*, arXiv:1311.0029 [hep-ph]. Phys. Lett. B **746**, 178 (2015) [arXiv:1504.00607 [hep-ex]]. S. Alekhin *et al.*, Rept. Prog. Phys. **79**, no. 12, 124201 (2016) doi:10.1088/0034-4885/79/12/124201 [arXiv:1504.04855 [hep-ph]]. P. Ilten, Y. Soreq, J. Thaler, M. Williams and W. Xue, Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, no. 25, 251803 (2016) [arXiv:1603.08926 [hep-ph]].

[24] C. Boehm and P. Fayet, Nucl. Phys. B **683**, 219 (2004) doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2004.01.015 [hep-ph/0305261].

[25] P. Fayet, Phys. Rev. D **70**, 023514 (2004) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.70.023514 [hep-ph/0403226].

[26] P. Schwaller, D. Stolarski and A. Weiler, JHEP **1505**, 059 (2015) doi:10.1007/JHEP05(2015)059 [arXiv:1502.05409 [hep-ph]].

[27] T. Cohen, M. Lisanti and H. K. Lou, Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, no. 17, 171804 (2015) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.115.171804 [arXiv:1503.00009 [hep-ph]].

[28] C. Englert, K. Nordstrm and M. Spannowsky, Phys. Rev. D **94**, no. 5, 055028 (2016) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.94.055028 [arXiv:1606.05359

[hep-ph]].
[29] N. F. Bell, Y. Cai and R. K. Leane, arXiv:1610.03063 [hep-ph].
[30] B. Holdom, Phys. Lett. **166B**, 196 (1986). doi:10.1016/0370-2693(86)91377-8
[31] E. J. Chun, J. C. Park and S. Scopel, JHEP **1102**, 100 (2011) doi:10.1007/JHEP02(2011)100 [arXiv:1011.3300 [hep-ph]].
[32] H. S. Lee and S. Yun, Phys. Rev. D **93**, no. 11, 115028 (2016) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.93.115028 [arXiv:1604.01213 [hep-ph]].
[33] H. Davoudiasl, H. S. Lee and W. J. Marciano, Phys. Rev. D **85**, 115019 (2012) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.85.115019 [arXiv:1203.2947 [hep-ph]].
[34] H. Davoudiasl, H. S. Lee and W. J. Marciano, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 031802 (2012) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.109.031802 [arXiv:1205.2709 [hep-ph]].
[35] N. Arkani-Hamed and N. Weiner, JHEP **0812**, 104 (2008) doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2008/12/104 [arXiv:0810.0714 [hep-ph]].
[36] C. Cheung, J. T. Ruderman, L. T. Wang and I. Yavin, Phys. Rev. D **80**, 035008 (2009) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.80.035008 [arXiv:0902.3246 [hep-ph]].
[37] H. S. Lee and M. S. Seo, arXiv:1608.02708 [hep-ph].
[38] M. Buschmann, J. Kopp, J. Liu and P. A. N. Machado, JHEP **07**, 045 (2015) doi:10.1007/JHEP07(2015)045 [arXiv:1505.07459 [hep-ph]].
[39] S. Catani, S. Dittmaier, M. H. Seymour and Z. Trocsanyi, Nucl. Phys. B **627**, 189 (2002) doi:10.1016/S0550-3213(02)00098-6 [hep-ph/0201036].
[40] J. M. Cornwall, D. N. Levin, and G. Tiktopoulos, Phys. Rev. D 10, 1145 (1974); C. E. Vayonakis, Lett. Nuov. Cim, 17, 383 (1976); B. W. Lee, C. Quigg, and H. Thacker, Phys. Rev. D 16, 1519 (1977); M. S. Chanowitz and M. K. Gaillard, NUcl. Phys. B 261, 379 (1985); J. Bagger and C. Schmidt, Phys. Rev. D41, 264 (1990); H. Veltman Phys. Rev. D 41, 2294 (1990); W. Beenakker and A. Werthenbach, DESY preprint 01-131, hep-ph/0112030.
[41] A. Wulzer, Nucl. Phys. B **885**, 97 (2014) doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2014.05.021 [arXiv:1309.6055 [hep-ph]].
[42] P. P. Srivastava and S. J. Brodsky, Phys. Rev. D **66**, 045019 (2002) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.66.045019 [hep-ph/0202141].
[43] J. Chen, T. Han and B. Tweedie, arXiv:1611.00788 [hep-ph].x
[44] G. Aad *et al.* [ATLAS Collaboration], JHEP **1411**, 088 (2014) doi:10.1007/JHEP11(2014)088 [arXiv:1409.0746 [hep-ex]]. The ATLAS collaboration [ATLAS Collaboration], ATLAS-CONF-2016-042.
[45] G. Aad *et al.* [ATLAS Collaboration], Eur. Phys. J. C **74**, no. 7, 2941 (2014) doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-014-2941-0 [arXiv:1404.2240 [hep-ex]].
[46] J. Goodman, M. Ibe, A. Rajaraman, W. Shepherd, T. M. P. Tait and H. B. Yu, Phys. Rev. D **82**, 116010 (2010) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.82.116010 [arXiv:1008.1783 [hep-ph]].
[47] A. Alloul, N. D. Christensen, C. Degrande, C. Duhr and B. Fuks, Comput. Phys. Commun. **185**, 2250 (2014) doi:10.1016/j.cpc.2014.04.012 [arXiv:1310.1921 [hep-ph]].
[48] J. Alwall *et al.*, JHEP **1407**, 079 (2014) doi:10.1007/JHEP07(2014)079 [arXiv:1405.0301 [hep-ph]].
[49] T. Sjstrand *et al.*, Comput. Phys. Commun. **191**, 159 (2015) doi:10.1016/j.cpc.2015.01.024 [arXiv:1410.3012 [hep-ph]];
[50] M. J. Strassler and K. M. Zurek, Phys. Lett. B **651**, 374 (2007) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2007.06.055 [hep-ph/0604261].
[51] T. Han, Z. Si, K. M. Zurek and M. J. Strassler, JHEP **0807**, 008 (2008) doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2008/07/008 [arXiv:0712.2041 [hep-ph]].
[52] L. Carloni and T. Sjostrand, JHEP **1009**, 105 (2010) doi:10.1007/JHEP09(2010)105 [arXiv:1006.2911 [hep-ph]]; L. Carloni, J. Rathsman and T. Sjostrand, JHEP **1104**, 091 (2011) doi:10.1007/JHEP04(2011)091 [arXiv:1102.3795 [hep-ph]].
[53] S. Mrenna and P. Skands, Phys. Rev. D **94**, no. 7, 074005 (2016) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.94.074005 [arXiv:1605.08352 [hep-ph]]; T. Sjostrand and P. Z. Skands, Eur. Phys. J. C **39**, 129 (2005) doi:10.1140/epjc/s2004-02084-y [hep-ph/0408302].
[54] J. de Favereau *et al.* [DELPHES 3 Collaboration], JHEP **1402**, 057 (2014) doi:10.1007/JHEP02(2014)057 [arXiv:1307.6346 [hep-ex]].
[55] N. Arkani-Hamed and N. Weiner, JHEP **0812**, 104 (2008) doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2008/12/104 [arXiv:0810.0714 [hep-ph]]. M. Baumgart, C. Cheung, J. T. Ruderman, L. T. Wang and I. Yavin, JHEP **0904**, 014 (2009) doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2009/04/014 [arXiv:0901.0283 [hep-ph]].
[56] V. Khachatryan *et al.* [CMS Collaboration], JINST **10**, no. 06, P06005 (2015) doi:10.1088/1748-0221/10/06/P06005 [arXiv:1502.02701 [physics.ins-det]]. G. Aad *et al.* [ATLAS Collaboration], Eur. Phys. J. C **74**, no. 7, 2941 (2014) doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-014-2941-0 [arXiv:1404.2240 [hep-ex]].
[57] Y. L. Dokshitzer, G. D. Leder, S. Moretti and B. R. Webber, JHEP **9708** (1997) 001 [hep-ph/9707323]; M. Wobisch and T. Wengler, In *Hamburg 1998/1999, Monte Carlo generators for HERA physics* 270-279 [hep-ph/9907280].
[58] M. Cacciari, G. P. Salam and G. Soyez, Eur. Phys. J. C **72**, 1896 (2012) doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-012-1896-2 [arXiv:1111.6097 [hep-ph]].